

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/626,697	07/25/2003	Piero Perlo	Q76660	2687	
75	590 05/04/2004		EXAM	INER	
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC.			SWIATEK, ROBERT P		
	nia Avenue, N.W. C 20037-3202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
washington, D	20037 3202		3643		
				DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/626,697	PERLO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit					
	Robert P. Swiatek	3643	4				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover she t with the	correspondence addr	ess				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tileply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) dailed will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed lys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this commodered the commodered that is commodered.	munication.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	July 2003						
<u> </u>	nis action is non-final.						
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application	on.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdo	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 July 2003</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	-	• •	1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document of the certified copies of the priority document of the priority docum	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been receiv	tion No	age				
application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ed.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I	y (PTO-413)	52)				
· apor 140(syrivian Date	6)						

Application/Control Number: 10/626,697

Art Unit: 3643

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as

the invention. In claim 1, line 1, the abbreviation "VTOL" is unclear and does not properly limit

the invention inasmuch as the expression it designates could change over time; the abbreviated

phrase should be written in its entirety. In claim 1, line 8, it is unclear what is meant by the wing

system being "positioned radially between said fuselage and said first and second rotor [sic]."

The wing system is positioned axially between the first and second rotors and radially between

the fuselage and baffle plates 12.

Claims 1-14 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s)

under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every

feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the control means associated with the

second ducted motor of claim 8, the organic-film solar cells of claim 12, and the silica wafer

surfaces of claim 13 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter

should be entered. The specification also should be amended accordingly to reflect any drawing

changes.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office

action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held

in abeyance.

Application/Control Number: 10/626,697 Page 3

Art Unit: 3643

Claims 1-14 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1, line 8, "rotor" should be changed to -rotors-; in claim 8, line 2, "to" should be changed to -with-.

Appropriate correction is required.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 3, line 24, "5" should be changed to -4-, in line 28, "is" should be changed to -are-; on page 4, line 1, the phrase "and allow to reduce" is unclear, in line 16, "Sid" is a misspelling; on page 6, line 7, "using," should be deleted; on page 7, line 29, "ore" is a misspelling; on page 9, line 23, "BY" should be changed to -By-.

Appropriate correction is required.

The patents to Cochran (US 3,002,709), Moffitt et al. (US 5,150,857), Cycon et al. (US 6,170,778 B1), and Plump et al. (US 6,691,949 B2) have been cited to provide examples of prior art VTOL aircraft.

RPS: \$703/308-2700

27 April 2004

ROBERT P. SWIATER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 333 3643